

REMARKS:

The Office Action dated July 27, 2006, has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the present paper, which is believed to be fully responsive to that Office Action, has been prepared.

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, the Examiner responsible for examining the present application has objected to the specification on the grounds that it is not clear which structure of the invention is being referred to by reference (9). The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because there is no antecedent basis for the term "the air cleaner" recited in the claims. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,557,399 to *Wolf*. Finally, the Examiner has rejected claims 2, 4-7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over several cited references.

Presently, claims 1-9 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is being amended to incorporate the features recited in claims 2 and 5 (claims 2 and 5 have been cancelled). Claim 8 is being amended to incorporate the features recited in claim 2. Thus, upon entry of this paper in the record, claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-9 will be pending.

Objection to the Specification

Included herewith is an instruction to replace the paragraph in the specification containing the incorrect reference number (i.e., "9" on page 7, line 20) with a new paragraph containing the correct reference number (i.e., "47"). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification are respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

By the present amendment, claim 2 has been canceled thereby rendering the rejection of claim 2 moot.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3, and 8 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,557,399 to *Wolf*. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

The *Wolf* patent does not disclose every feature of the cyclone dust collector of the present invention as recited in amended claims 1 and 8. For example, the *Wolf* patent, as the Examiner acknowledges on page 3 of the Office Action, does not disclose a handle that is "double-bent," as recited in claims 1 and 8. Thus, the *Wolf* patent does not anticipate those claims. For the same reason, the *Wolf* patent does not anticipate claim 3, which depends from claim 1.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, and 8 are respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 2 and 4 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wolf* in view of DE 414228 and KR1997-0032643. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection with respect to claim 4 (claim 2 has been cancelled).

The cited references do not teach or suggest using a cyclone dust collector disposed on the double-bent part of the handle tube in order to separate dust from the air drawn into the handle tube as recited in claim 1 (from which claim 4 depends). Thus, the cited references do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 are respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 5-7 and 9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 5-7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wolf* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,835 to *Song*. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection with respect to claims 6 and 7 (claim 5 has been cancelled).

The cited references do not teach or suggest using a cyclone dust collector disposed on the double-bent part of the handle tube in order to separate dust from the air drawn into the handle tube as recited in claim 1 (from which claims 6 and 7 depend) and claim 9. The location of the cyclone near the handle portion of the double-bent handle tube allows for easier reach by the user. The cited references do not suggest or provide any motivation to position a cyclone near the handle portion for that purpose (the Examiner contends that the motivation to include a cyclone lies in the ability of the cyclone to reduce the quantity of dirt collected in the main body of the cleaner and to prevent the deterioration of the suction force and overload the motor). Thus, the cited references do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 1 (or with regard to dependent claims 6 and 7).

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 7, and 9 are respectfully requested.